

Applicant : Min Zhu, et al.  
Appl. No. : 10/001,435  
Examiner : Kamal B. Divecha  
Docket No. : 16440.4015

### Remarks

Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, and 28-31 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. No new subject matter has been added.

### Interview Summary

As an initial matter, the applicant wishes to express his gratitude for the examiner's time spent on a phone interview held between Joseph Liu, attorney for applicant, and the examiner on March 3rd, 2006. During the interview, the examiner provided specific instructions on how to overcome his objection to the specification and also acknowledged that changing the term "control" to "access" in the claims will overcome the 112 rejection, as discussed below. Also discussed was the issue of whether the Slaughter reference disclosed controlling a remote computer's desktop. The Examiner agreed that Slaughter did not disclose controlling a remote computer's desktop (wherein desktop is the user's workspace within the remote computer); however, no agreement was made as to allowability.

### Rejections under 35 USC §112

Claims 1-2, 11-12, and 28-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement because of the recitation of "control of the desktop."

### Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-2 and claims 11-12 have been rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Slaughter, III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,598,536). The applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 11, as amended, are in condition for allowance because none of the cited references, by themselves or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest accessing the desktop of a remote computer. In a phone interview between the applicant's attorney and the examiner, the applicant explained that the term "desktop" referred to the user's workspace within the computer. Under that meaning, the applicant respectfully submits that though Slaughter does teach a remote computer accessing a computer network via a remote access server (Fig. 1 of Slaughter, III et al.), none of the cited references, individually or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest enabling a remote computer accessing the desktop of

Applicant : Min Zhu, et al.  
Appl. No. : 10/001,435  
Examiner : Kamal B. Divecha  
Docket No. : 16440.4015

a target computer as required by claim 1 as disclosed in para. [0038] of the present application. Furthermore, none of the cited references, individually, or in combination, disclose teach or suggest a computer system having a first computer access the desktop of a second computer through a central server computer system via a global computer network as required by claim 11. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 11 and their corresponding dependent claims 2, 12, and 28-31 are patentable over the cited references.

Applicant : Min Zhu, et al.  
Appl. No. : 10/001,435  
Examiner : Kamal B. Divecha  
Docket No. : 16440.4015

Conclusion

Prompt and favorable action on the merits of the claims is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the undersigned can be reached at (949) 567-6700.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee which may be required in connection with this Amendment to deposit account No. 15-0665.

Respectfully submitted,

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

Dated: March 2, 2006

By: 

Joseph K. Liu  
Reg. No. 51,957

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP  
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600  
Irvine, CA 92614-2558  
Tel. 949-567-6700  
Fax: 949-567-6710